REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-reference application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 are amended, and claims 1-48 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-11, 13-23, 25-35, and 37-47 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0026244 by Pietrowicz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,226 to Uchida et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner argued on pages 5-6 of the Official Action that the term "partitioning" could be construed to encompass the well-known "tile layout". In particular, the Examiner asserted on page 5 that the display screen of Uchida can be "partitioned" into the distinct display areas because "application windows can be arranged in *overlapping or tile formats*". Further, the Examiner asserted that "[i]t is well known in the art [that] windows can be arranged in different layouts such [as] overlapping layouts [or] tile layouts. The tile layout is partitioning the display screen."

The fact that "application windows *can* be arranged in *overlapping or tile formats*" demonstrates that a fundamental requirement of the prior art arrangement is that the application window layout is controlled *by the user*: The prior art provides *the user* the option to choose whether to utilize overlapping windows or tiled windows. As argued previously, this option of providing *the user* the option of choosing between overlapping windows or tiled windows has required the use of a pointing device.

The claims have been amended to explicitly specify that the *partitioning* of the display screen into the distinct display areas results in *"preventing any of the display areas from ever overlapping another one of the display areas."* Hence, the independent claims as amended specifically exclude the ability of a user of **ever** utilizing overlapping display screens.

Hence, the claimed partitioning by preventing any of the display areas from ever overlapping another one of the display areas enables efficient arbitration of display requests on a per-display area basis.

As admitted by the Examiner, Uchida relies on a conventional pointing device such as a mouse in order to provide GUI control to a user (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 5-10). Further, Uchida relies on conventional display windows: as admitted by the Examiner, each window on the display screen

"can be controlled independently such as moving or resizing".

Since Uchida neither discloses nor suggests preventing any of the display areas from ever overlapping another one of the display areas, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 95-469, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 23164
(202) 261-1059
Date: November 23, 2005

Amendment filed November 23, 2005
Appln. No. 09/955,129
Page 12